

Applicant : Greg Galazin et al.
Appln. No. : 10/800,953
Page -12-

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached three sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1, 5 and 18. The three sheets, which include Figs. 1, 5 and 18, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1, 5 and 18. In Fig. 1, previously omitted reference 28 has been added. In Fig. 5, cross-sectional reference VII-VII has been amended to VIII-VIII and cross-sectional reference VI-VI has been amended to VII-VII. In Fig. 18, reference number 184 has been amended to 185, 186 has been amended to 187, and previously omitted reference numeral 180 has been added.

Attachment: 3 Replacement Sheets
3 Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12-15 and 22-31 are currently pending in the present application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed review of the specification and claims, the allowance of claim 1-3, 5, 6, 12-15, 22-28, 30 and 31, and the indicated allowability of claim 29.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The drawings were rejected to for various informalities, the majority of which have been addressed by amendment to the specification and drawings, a copy of which is submitted herewith. With respect to points H and L in the Office Action, Applicants note that the thickness of part 74 does in fact change along the length thereof, as is noted by the Examiner in the section of the Office Action relating to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, wherein the Office Action sets forth that "claim 29 is apparently reversed (the portion of the trailing arm adjacent the beam bracket is not thicker than the other portion of the trailing arm)." Applicants note that Fig. 5 clearly illustrates that the thickness of the lower flange is greater at the end located proximate the axle as compared to the end located proximate the hanger bracket. With respect to objection L, it is noted that part 106 is in fact integral with part 70. Although these two components are not perfectly proximate one another, they are integrally formed elements of the overall beam

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION:

Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the objections as set forth by the Examiner. However, Applicants set forth with respect to 4b, that "cast," is grammatically correct in this instance. With respect to 4c Applicants submit that "finite element analysis" is a term widely known and accepted in the engineering arts as a technique for modeling a complex structure, and specifically a mathematical model that is created to analyze a system that is subjected to known loads, wherein the displacement of the structure or system may be determined. Applicants submit that no further definition of this term is necessary in the application itself so as to enable the disclosure to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant : Greg Galazin et al.
Appln. No. : 10/800,953
Page -14-

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claims 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 29 has been amended in accordance with the rejections as set forth by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 10 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pierce et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,508,482 and Dilling et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,366,237, respectively. Applicants believe these rejections to be moot in view of the cancellation of these claims from the present application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce et al., claims 19 and 20 as being unpatentable over Dilling et al., in view of Pierce, and claim 20 as being unpatentable over Dilling et al. in view of Wallace, U.S. Patent No. 4,858,949. Applicants believe these rejections to be moot in view of the cancellation of these claims from the present application.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10-15 and 22-31 are now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Price, Heneveld, Cooper,
DeWitt & Litton, LLP

Dated: June 19, 2008

/Brian E. Ainsworth/

Brian E. Ainsworth
Registration No. 45 808
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

BEA:kjc